

Update on the Quarterly Report for Kings County Office of Education October 2011

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents a report on the action plan submitted by Kings County Office of Education (Kings COE) as required by the COA. Also included in this report is general timeline for next steps for completion of activities required by the COA.

Staff Recommendation

Staff has reviewed the first quarterly report and action plan submitted by Kings COE pursuant to COA direction in June 2011. No action is required on this item at this time.

Background

On June 24, 2011, the Committee on Accreditation, on behalf of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, assigned the status of *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* to Kings COE and its approved General Education (Multiple and Single Subject) Induction program (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2011-06/2011-06-item-21.pdf>).

As a result of the decision of Probationary Stipulations, the COA placed the following stipulations on Kings COE:

- The program needs to broaden and stabilize advisory board participation to consistently represent stakeholders of the Kings County Office of Education's Teacher Induction Program (TIP). The advisory board needs to develop a clear guiding vision for the preparation of educators.
- Data needs to be analyzed and used at the program and unit level to guide program improvements and to provide data to the Support Providers within the program.
- All stakeholders must be apprised of the function of FACT as a guide for a formative induction program that supports candidates' growth and attainment of professional goals as guided by their IIP. Support Providers must agree to create or capitalize on opportunities for intentional candidate learning in the appropriate pedagogical practices and use of adopted standards-aligned instructional materials and resources (e.g., varying curriculum depth and complexity, managing Para educators, using assistive and other technologies) and to provide intensive individualized support and assistance to help their candidates' demonstrate and apply pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in their preliminary credential program.
- The program needs to establish criteria that provides for the demonstration and application of professional knowledge and skills beyond what was learned during pre service.
- Quarterly reports are to be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation reflecting progress toward meeting the stipulations above. The first quarterly report will be due on September 15, 2011.
- A return visit is to take place within one year of this action.

In accordance with the stipulations placed upon Kings COE in June 2011, Kings COE submitted an action plan on September 15, 2011 to address all stipulations. The report covers the period beginning summer 2011 through May 2012. First, Kings COE conducted an analysis of the team's report and each of COA's stipulations. Second, this plan of action describes how each of the stipulations the COA placed on Kings COE will be addressed during 2011-12.

Finally, Kings COE's quarterly report included an action plan to address each standard that was less than fully met. In order to determine the actions that would be necessary, the table below was developed. The strengths that were identified in the site visit team's report are stated in the left hand column under each standard. In the right hand column, the "Key Areas of Growth" for each standard as they were stated in the site visit team's report are provided. Staff completed an analysis and confirms that the Key Areas for Growth identified by Kings COE address the issues identified in the accreditation site visit team's report and the COA's stipulations.

Standard/ Strengths	Team Finding	Key Areas for Growth
Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director only a phone call/e-mail • Unit properly implements and monitors the credential recommendation process 	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders minimally involved in the organization, coordination, and governance program • Sporadic involvement in the program interferes with development of a clear vision, does not allow for full county participation and keeps collaborative program decisions from occurring • Stakeholders not consistently represented in the governance body • Leadership & administrative functions performed via informal means • Lack of opportunity provided the advisory group to fully investigate problems or to provide input into program policies • No evidence that district partners or professional development providers regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in college/university units or with members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching and candidate learning
2: Program Assessment and Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCOE TIP has a process for collecting data • Data reports were shared • External evaluator contracted to evaluate data 	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited evidence to indicate that analyses of unit and program data are used to identify areas for program improvement • Little evidence that analyses of data reports informed program improvement/ changes made to the program are directly related to analyses of the data. • Data is not effectively used for improvement purposes. • SPs indicated that monthly meetings have not informed their practice nor have they helped develop skills for helping PTs • Surveys of SPs and PTs indicated that they needed more information about how to implement FACT

Standard/ Strengths	Team Finding	Key Areas for Growth
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes implemented focus narrowly on the next month's FACT activities and the use of a data collection system, TaskStream, to monitor PTs completion of FACT documents rather than on helping SPs develop a deeper understanding of the purpose of FACT.
4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit is aware of the importance of identifying faculty & instructional personnel who are reflective of a diverse society/ knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic & gender PD offerings include an emphasis on on-going reflective collaboration that supports the on-going development of the PTs instructional practice SPs attend formative assessment training on FACT and monthly meetings led by the Program Director and designed to assist in securing a thorough grasp of standards, frameworks, and focus on a completion monitoring system that is driving the program 	<p align="center">Not Met</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No current selection process is defined for PD trainers- individuals identified as professional development providers were initially hired years ago and then are re-hired every year Feedback to SPs occurs primarily on an informal basis & focuses overwhelmingly on document completion; no evidence that feedback addresses how to enhance skills in facilitating reflective dialogue that is driven by the plan-teach-reflect-apply model Did not see evidence that the unit formally recognizes excellence or retains only those SPs who are consistently effective No confirmation of the expertise of professional developers' grasp of academic standards, frameworks and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. Little evidence that professional development providers have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, or model best practices in teaching and learning, scholarship and service No evidence to confirm that feedback from course evaluations is used to improve the alignment between the training & the needs of the PTs
6: Advice and Assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel join county credential technicians at monthly credential tech meetings. Credential procedures and Commission updates are shared to ensure that qualified unit members are assigned and available for candidate advisement and professional placement. 	<p align="center">Met with Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little evidence that completion of program requirements ensures that candidates are suited for advancement in the profession. Ongoing feedback is provided on candidate progress toward requirement <u>completion</u> but <i>not</i> regarding <u>performance</u> as measured by reflective practice.

Standard/ Strengths	Team Finding	Key Areas for Growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Year 1 PTs attend a program orientation conducted by the Program Director. • Interviews with stakeholders repeatedly confirmed the Director is accessible, knowledgeable and lends ongoing support to stakeholders • Education unit provides information and assistance to all candidates 		
7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit has selected and implemented a planned sequence of experiences through the adopted formative assessment system, FACT 	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence that partners (e.g., advisory committee, SPs) assisted in determining how the formative assessment system be implemented, evaluated, and aligned with district needs • Little evidence that the candidates use the formative assessment process to grow and develop as practitioners
9: Assessment of Candidate Competence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Program Director regularly reviews the postings to determine whether the FACT documents have been completed. 	Not Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of a defined vision of candidate competency • Majority of PTs focused on document <u>completion</u> and <u>compliance</u> with completion deadlines <i>rather than</i> on the <u>competencies</u> identified in the Induction Standards • The program is form-driven rather than behavior-driven • No consistent body of evidence to suggest that the educational unit understands that the goal of Induction is to develop the habits of mind demonstrated by teachers who know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students
Program Standard 1: Program Design and Rationale	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP's awareness of overall program design and program vision did not support their application at a learning-centered level. • Overwhelmingly, the candidates, SPs and Administrators who were interviewed mentioned completion of "documents" and due dates when asked to define the program goals. • Evidence could not be found that the IIP is developed and discussed with the support provider prior to the end of process submission. • IIP completion does not support the growth and attainment of

Standard/ Strengths	Team Finding	Key Areas for Growth
		professional goals.
Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited evidence was found to demonstrate articulation with preliminary teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations in order to facilitate the transition from teacher preparation to induction and to build upon and provide opportunities for demonstration and application of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program. Administrator interviews on the topic of support did not provide evidence to indicate that steps had been implemented to address challenging assignments for new teachers.
Program Standard 3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of evidence that monthly meetings translates to assist participating teachers to develop the habits of mind necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state contend standards. Evidence not found of support providers facilitating the participating teachers through the reflective analysis of their instructional practice using the formative assessment process. No evidence that SPs are assessed by program leadership or that formative feedback is provided to the support provider.
Program Standard 4: Formative Assessment System	Not Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews revealed that participating teachers often completed FACT assignments through the electronic system of TaskStream on their own. Lack of evidence that an inquiry based formative assessment system is used as intended to foster a reflective practitioner with the Kings COE Induction program. Review of IIPs revealed that identified actions inconsistently reflected the teachers' understanding of appropriate strategies to use to improve student learning.
Program Standard 5: Pedagogy	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed documents did not illustrate that PTs grew or improved in their ability to reflect upon and apply their insights of the CSTPs Limited evidence of use of available technology to advance student learning
Program Standard 6: Universal Access	Met with Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of intentional candidate learning in the appropriate pedagogical practices related to teaching Special Needs students

For each identified Key Area for Growth, Kings COE has identified specific actions to address the area. For example with respect to Common Standard 1 and the “Lack of opportunity

provided the advisory group to fully investigate problems or to provide input into program policies” the following actions are identified:

Expand Advisory Committee Members to include representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- KCOE Human Resources
- Curriculum & Instruction Departments
- District Leaders
- Site Administrators
- District/site academic coaches
- SPs and PTs
- Institutes of Higher Education
- Retired teachers

Advisory Committee meetings will be designed to:

- foster collaboration based on review of local/state program data and District needs
- assess & monitor program effectiveness
- suggest program modifications, if needed
- collect future agenda topics for discussion at the end of meeting
- elicit District input into program design
- provide a comprehensive outline of policies/procedures and theory
- identify possible areas of professional development
- elicit specific suggestions of candidate competency to add to Year-end/Exit Interview Questions per District
- customize Year-end/Exit Interview Questions and Rubrics per District based on specific goals and needs

To increase consistent Advisory Committee attendance, program leadership will:

- e-mail meeting reminders and agendas in advance of meetings to allow for members to submit additional discussion topics
- monitor RSVPs to contact those who do not respond or are unable to attend
- schedule follow-up meetings with members unable to attend

In the timeline column, specific dates are provided for each activity and for activities that have been completed, there are links to supporting documentation provided. The task of “Expand Advisory Committee Members to include representatives...” the timeline was July through September 2011 and the following supporting documentation was provided, through an electronic ‘dropbox.’

[2011-12 BTSA Advisory Committee Contact List](#)

[Initial District Contact Agenda](#)

[Advisory Committee Calendar](#)

For the “Advisory Committee meetings will be designed...” activity there are plans to provide all Advisory Committee agendas and meeting minutes. Finally for this one area, there are multiple

steps planned to “To increase consistent Advisory Committee attendance....” The documentation for this area includes the Correspondence reminders, the RSVP report, and finally the meeting sign-in sheets.

This example provides the detail for how Kings COE plans to address one of the areas for growth related to Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership. There are five additional areas for growth identified for Common Standard 1 and each has a similarly detailed plan with supporting documentation linked to the plan. In addition, for each of the other eleven standards that were not found to be fully met by the site visit team, a similarly detailed plan has been developed and is in early implementation.

Next Steps

The next quarterly report is due December 15, 2011, a third on March 15, 2012 and the re-visit is tentatively scheduled for May 22-24, 2012. Staff will present an update at the February 2012 COA meeting on Kings COE’s continued progress in addressing the COA’s stipulations.